

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the correction of the drawings by the submission of a replacement sheet and amendments to the specification and claims as submitted above.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 11 has been amended to eliminate the indefiniteness noted by the Examiner in claims 19 and 20 and claims 19 and 20 have been canceled.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-15, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McHorse et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,073,714. Applicants have amended claim 1 to better distinguish the McHorse reference.

Claims 6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kincaid et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,954,353, in view of McHorse et al. Claims 1, 8, 11 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hein, U.S. Patent No. 5,224,790, in view of Boor, U.S. Patent No. 2,078,367. The amendments to claim 1 focuses the claim on a concept that is not disclosed or suggested by any of the prior art references. The amendments to claim 11 are intended to embody the concept of originally submitted claim 20 that was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim the embodiment of the invention wherein the stabilizer bar has one annular ring that is received within the groove defined within the inner surface of the first bushing. The second bushing is assembled to the stabilizer bar in a range of positions that accommodate tolerance stackup while the first bushing immediately resists lateral movement of the stabilizer bar. This problem is identified in paragraph 7 of the Background Art section of the application. Figures 5 and 6 illustrate two such bushings that are attached to a stabilizer bar. This embodiment is described in paragraph 29 of the

application which explains how these two identical bushings may be used with one bushing tightly engaging the annular ring on the stabilizer bar and with the other bushing being flexibly located on the stabilizer bar but precisely located relative to the frame attachment location. Claim 1 has been amended to state that the location of the first bushing is established based upon the location of the annular ring. The second bushing is attached to the stabilizer bar at a location on the stabilizer bar that aligns with the second location on the vehicle.

In contrast, the McHorse patent is for a truck cab suspension system that uses two stabilizer bar bushing assemblies 116 and 114 that are identical and described with reference to a mounting 116. By necessary inference, both of the mountings 114 and 116 each engage a collar 120 that is assembled to the stabilizer bar. McHorse fails to describe a stabilizer bar assembly wherein one bushing engages an annular ring while the other bushing does not engage an annular ring but forms a void when assembled to the stabilizer bar.

The Hein reference discloses a single mounting assembly and does not disclose a second mounting assembly that is located as claimed. In the Boor reference, two identical clamps are described that have no groove for engaging a ring on the stabilizer bar. No combination of Hein and Boor teaches or suggests the suspension assembly claimed in amended claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from amended claim 1 and are believed to be patentable based upon the arguments advanced above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 11, 19 and 20 and to address the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have eliminated the references to the first and second surface features and has replaced them with references to the rib and receptacle. Applicants have also amended claim 11 to state that the protrusion on the stabilizer bar is convex while the recess in the bushing defines a concave wall. The protrusion defines a convex outer surface that engages the concave wall of the bushing. Applicants have simplified the terminology used in amended claim 11 to

meet the Examiner's rejection under § 112 for indefiniteness. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claim 20 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claim.

Claims 12-18 depend from claim 11 and are submitted to be patentable for the same reasons advanced with regard to amended claim 11 above.

Claim 21 has been added to depend from claim 11 and to further specify that the convex outer surface and the concave wall are both partially spherical.

Claim 22 has been added to depend from claim 1 and claim the concept of providing a second bushing that is a duplicate of the first bushing. The second bushing also defines a groove, however the second groove and stabilizer bar form a void around the stabilizer bar when assembled together, instead of being assembled to an annular ring, as is the case with the first bushing. Claim 22 is submitted to further define the invention of claim 1.

The number of claims remaining after the amendment is the same as the number of claims originally submitted and it is respectfully submitted that no fee is required for the submission of the claims as amended above.

Applicants have amended the claims of the application, the specification and have submitted a replacement drawing to place this case in condition for allowance. The

Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it would advance prosecution of this case. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON STERLY, et al.

By



Kevin J. Heinl

Reg. No. 29,805

Attorney/Agent for Applicants

Date: February 16, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351